

01-18-00

LAW OFFICES

## NIKOLAI, MERSEREAU &amp; DIETZ, P.A.

THOMAS J. NIKOLAI  
 JAMES T. NIKOLAI  
 CHARLES G. MERSEREAU  
 PAUL T. DIETZ  
 STEVEN E. KAHM  
 KIMBERLY S. ZILLIG



International Centre  
 900 Second Avenue South, Suite 820  
 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3813  
 Telephone (612) 339-7461  
 Facsimile (612) 349-6556

PATENTS  
 TRADE MARKS  
 COPYRIGHTS  
 UNFAIR COMPETITION

e-mail: paul@nmd-iplaw.com  
 direct dial: 612-392-7306

EL395572534US



January 14, 2000

Our File No. 990479.ORI

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

## Box PATENT APPLICATION

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
 Washington, D. C. 20231

Sir:

Enclosed herewith for filing is the patent application of inventor(s), Joseph K. Cross for "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROBABILISTIC QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION SERVICE DETERMINATION" together with the following:

- (1) One copy of five (5) sheets of drawings;
- (2) A Declaration, Power of Attorney and Petition; and
- (3) The filing and recording fees thereon are calculated as follows:
 

|                                     |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Basic Fee.....                      | \$ 760.00  |
| Total number of claims in excess    |            |
| of 20, times \$18.00 .....          | \$ 360.00  |
| Number of independent claims,       |            |
| minus 3, times \$78.00.....         | \$ 78.00   |
| Surcharge fee (\$270.00) for filing |            |
| of multiple dependent claim(s)..... | \$ 0       |
| Fee for recording assignment.....   | \$ 40.00   |
| Total Filing.....                   | \$1,238.00 |


A check in the amount of \$1,238.00 is enclosed to cover the filing and recording fees.

Page 2

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees or refund any overpayment under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 08-1265.

Yours very truly,

NIKOLAI, MERSEREAU &amp; DIETZ, P.A.

  
Paul T. Dietz

PTD/tr  
Enclosures

Express Mail No. EL395572534US

PATENT APPLICATION

Docket No. 990479.ORI

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re App : Joseph K. Cross

: January 14, 2000

For : SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROBABILISTIC QUALITY  
OF COMMUNICATION SERVICE DETERMINATION

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING VIA EXPRESS MAIL

BOX PATENT APPLICATIONS  
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D. C. 20231

Sir:

I hereby certify that the attached patent application consisting of 12 pages of specifications, 6 pages of claims, 1 page of abstract, one copy of 5 sheets of patent drawings, 2 pages of a Declaration, Power of Attorney, and Petition, 2 pages of an executed Assignment, a transmittal cover letter, recordation form cover sheet and a check in the amount of \$1,238.00 in payment of the filing and recording fees, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and are addressed to: BOX PATENT APPLICATIONS, Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, under Express Mail Post Office to Addressee Label No. EL395572534US.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI, MERSEREAU & DIETZ, P.A.



Theresa Russek  
Secretary to Paul T. Dietz  
Attorney for Applicant  
900 Second Avenue South, #820  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 339-7461

## SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROBABILISTIC QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION SERVICE DETERMINATION

### I. Field of the Invention

This invention relates generally to multiple devices having systems capable of linking between other device systems, wherein a first system may provide services to a second linked system. More particularly, the present invention relates to devices capable of establishing or terminating a link between first and second systems dependant upon whether a predefined minimum level of quality of service can be provided by the first system to the second linked system. The predefined minimum level of quality of service is defined by the second system, wherein the definition is independent of the system requirements or hardware configuration of the first system.

### II. Background of the Invention

Over the years, the ability of multiple devices having computer based control systems to, for example, "communicate" with one another has become increasingly important both economically and otherwise. This communication between devices requires transmitting information from one device to another. The quality of the communication transfer or transmission may be characterized by several factors including the latency (the time between the transmission of the information and its reception), reliability (the proportion of transmitted messages that are received) and security (freedom from interception, destruction, or intentional alteration by a third party). Each of these variables may be critical to an adequate communication between the devices depending upon the type of communication being transmitted. For example, latency is critical to video conferencing, reliability is critical in aircraft avionics and security is critical in electronic banking.

At times, the transmitting device may require a "guarantee" that a communication mechanism with the receiving device can provide a minimum quality of communication service before transmitting or communicating information to the receiving device. In the past, inherent in the definition of quality of service has been a recognition that the quality of communication service will be limited by the system constraints or hardware configuration of the receiving device. When the system or hardware of the communication mechanism is upgraded, the transmitting device or at least the definition of

the quality of communication service may also need to be upgraded in order to continue communication with the receiving device via the upgraded mechanism or to utilize the improvements to the communication mechanism. Hence, although a communication mechanism's system constraints or hardware configuration may potentially affect the quality of communication service, it is desirable that the minimum threshold of quality of communication service with the receiving device be defined independent of the communication mechanism's system constraints or hardware configuration.

The quality of communication service between the receiving device and transmitting device may also vary depending upon the medium of transmission (e.g. radio waves, copper wire, etc.) and/or the priority given the transmission (e.g. different communications may be given different priorities thereby improving the quality of service provided to one at the expense of the other). Further, the way a particular medium is used by the communication mechanism and user may affect the quality of service (ie: having the recipient of each packet of transmitted information check for errors and return a positive or negative acknowledgement to the sender may increase reliability at a cost of increased latency). Also, routers and switches may be utilized to control the multifunctioning services of the communication mechanism to decrease latency without significant affects on reliability.

A selection of the communication mechanism at the time communication is to begin provides several benefits: the communicating systems get the qualities they require, the resources used for communication are more fully used, and new communication resources (hardware and software) can be installed/exploited without requiring changes to the system that will use those resources (ie: required changes to the application software).

In the past, quality of communication service has typically been defined by requiring one or more of the following: a specific medium, qualitative specifications and/or token-bucket specifications. A medium-specific specification is limited to one physical communication medium. For example, "OC-3" is a quality of service (in fact, a bandwidth, in bits per second) that makes sense for the SONET (Synchronous Optical Network) medium, but is meaningless in, for example, a BISDN (Broadband Integrated Services Digital Network). Thus there is a need for a device that is capable of defining quality of service independent of the medium being utilized.

Another medium-specific specification may require that the communication service be provided of the same quality that would be obtained if no other systems were using the medium. Such specifications suffer from the fact that they may become meaningless when the transmission medium is changed, and they are useless when several media are used to transmit a message.

Qualitative specifications are also limited in effectiveness. Qualitative specifications are expressed using a few terms such as “best effort” and “urgent” and may provide little assurance to the transmitting system that the subjective standard will be interpreted the same by the receiving system. Also, qualitative specifications have no verifiable semantics, and are therefore applicable only to problem domains where such vagueness and uncertainty is acceptable.

A token-bucket specification has precise semantics and is independent of any communication medium. However, token-bucket specifications are limited to a very narrow range of communication possibilities. A token-bucket is a particular form of communication traffic specification consisting of a “token rate”  $r$  and a “bucket size”  $b$ . The token-bucket specification allows several systems to be connected and communicating with a single receiving system. The  $r$  parameter specifies the continually sustainable data rate of the receiving system, while the  $b$  parameter specifies the extent to which the data rate can exceed the sustainable level for short periods of time. The communication traffic must obey the rule that over all time periods, the amount of data sent cannot exceed  $rT + b$ , where  $T$  is the length of the time period. Evidently, token-bucket specifications cannot allow for common traffic patterns, such as strictly periodic events, or completely random (Poisson) events.

Other past devices have defined quality of communication service and load in terms of a specific quantity or number. For example, the values of latency, inter-service time, message size, and the like have been defined as constants. In some cases this is appropriate, as when messages of a known and constant size will be sent on a rigidly periodic schedule; however, a requirement to use a constant or single value to define the quality of service has required the application defining the quality of service to use worst-case values, resulting in poor resource utilization.

Also, past communication systems have not allowed the transmitting system to adequately define its requirements for quality of communication service prior to

establishing a communication link with the receiving system. The present invention meets these and other needs that will become apparent from a review of the description of the present invention.

### SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

5 A system for determining whether an interface is capable of fulfilling a quality of service demand of an application is provided by the device and method of the present invention. The present invention includes an interface to an application, wherein the interface is capable of linking or "negotiating" with a plurality of applications and also performing services for the applications. The initial communications or requests sent from  
10 each application to the interface include a demand specifier that defines a required quality of service to be provided by the interface. A capability of the interface to provide the required quality of service is determined upon initiating a link or negotiation between the interface and the application. Without limitation, the device and method of the present invention may find application in networked computers, telecommunication links,  
15 aerospace and other applications that include linked devices wherein one device performs a service for the other. The device and method of the present invention may be utilized but is not limited to use in networks utilizing Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM).

The form of the demand specifier does not depend upon system requirements or medium linking the interface and application. The demand specifier includes a probability  
20 assertion, which may express or require a predefined maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service, a predefined minimum reliability of the link between the interface and the applications, and/or a predefined required security of the link. The probability assertion of the demand specifier is defined by a pair of density bounds, wherein the pair of density bounds may express a predefined  
25 maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service, a predefined minimum reliability of the link between the interface and the applications and/or a predefined required security of the link.

In use, a demand specifier is incorporated within the application, wherein the demand specifier defines a required quality of service to be performed by an interface. An  
30 initial link or negotiation between an application and interface is undertaken. Upon initializing the negotiation or link between the application and interface, the interface

determines whether it is capable of performing the required quality of service of the application as defined by the demand specifier. Significant is the fact that the demand specifier does not depend upon system requirements of the interface. The negotiation or initial link is terminated between the interface and application if the interface is not capable of performing the quality of service required by the application. If the interface is capable of meeting the demand specifier of the application, then the communication link or "contract" between the application and interface is established.

The advantages of the present invention should become readily apparent to those skilled in the art from a review of the following detailed description of the preferred embodiment especially when considered in conjunction with the claims and accompanying drawings in which like numerals in the several views refer to corresponding parts.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 is a general schematic showing the initial communication link or "negotiation" between an application system and support software interface;

Figure 2 is a flow diagram of a method of the present invention to determine whether a communication link should be established between a system application and supporting interface;

Figure 3 is a graph of a distribution of latencies defined by its cumulative distribution function having a continuous probability assertion;

Figure 4 is a graph of a distribution of latencies defined by its cumulative distribution function having a discrete probability assertion; and

Figure 5 is a graph showing both a continuous probability assertion and a discrete probability assertion shown relative to the other.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENT

The present invention represents broadly applicable improvements to communicating devices and defining the quality of communication between the devices. The embodiments detailed herein are intended to be taken as representative or exemplary of those in which the improvements of the invention may be incorporated and are not intended to be limiting.

In the past, the definition of the quality of communication service between a transmitting and receiving device has been limited by particular identified constraints. The



present invention provides for a transmitting device that defines the quality of communication service independent of the particular system constraints or hardware configuration of the receiving device. Although the device and method of the present invention will be described in terms of communication between application software of a transmitting device and application software of a receiving device mediated through support software interfaced to each, those skilled in the art will appreciate that the present invention may be utilized in many other applications and interfaces including, for example without limitation, a communication link between networked computers, a communication link between a router and remote device, a communication link between an aircraft and ground control, etc.

The preferred embodiment includes a system of one or more applications capable of specifying to an interface the quality of service required by the application when an initial communication link or negotiation is undertaken. For illustrative purposes, Figure 1 shows a communication link 14 between first and second application programs 10 and 12 respectively. Prior to establishing the communication link 14 wherein data 16 is transmitted from the first application program 10 to the second application program 12, each application program specifies a required quality of service to the interface 18. In addition, the sending application program 10 may specify a load that it will impose. The qualities of service and load are expressed or defined by probability assertions as described below in greater detail. The interfaces 18 then processes these requests and determines whether the interface and the underlying communication links are capable of providing the requested qualities of service under the specified load. If the interface 18 and underlying communication link 14 are capable of providing the requested qualities of service under the specified load, then the communication link (which may be likened to a contract) is established and the data 16 is transmitted from the sending application 10 to the receiving application 12. As long as the quantity and rate of transmission of the data remains within the specified load, the data will be delivered with the specified quality of service.

Those skilled in the art will appreciate that specifying the quality of service of load may be performed manually or automatically. Referring now to Figure 2, in the preferred embodiment an author of the software of the transmitting application 10 sets or defines the minimum acceptable or desirable level of quality of service (Q of S) for the application (see block 20) and the minimum acceptable or desirable load (e.g. amount of data) that the

application will transmit (see block 22). The transmitting application program then initializes a communication with the interface (likening the establishment of a link to the formation of a contract, the application program undertakes a negotiation with the interface), specifying that the service of transmitting be at a specified load of data with the specified quality of service (see block 24). The interface then determines whether, given the currently available communication links, it is possible to transmit the specified load of data with the specified quality of service (see decision block 26). If the interface is capable of providing the specified load at the specified quality of service, then a communication link between the application and interface is established (see block 28).

If the interface is not capable of providing the requested service (the quality of service demand at the specified load), then the application request is denied, and the application determines whether its Q of S demand may be reduced (see decision block 30). If the Q of S demand may be reduced then the Q of S is set at a reduced demand (likening to contract negotiations, a counteroffer is made) and the communication link is again initiated at the reduced Q of S (see loop 32). If the Q of S demand cannot be reduced then the application determines if the load can be reduced (see decision block 34). If the load is reducible, then the load is specified at a reduced load (likening to contract negotiations, a counteroffer is made) and the communication link is again initiated at the reduced specified load (see loop 36). If neither the Q of S or the load may be modified, then the link is terminated without communication (see block 38).

The receiving application 12 also conducts a "negotiation" with the interface 18 to determine whether the interface is able to meet its required quality of service. If the interface 18 is able to meet the quality of service and load specified by the transmitting application 10 and the quality of service specified by the receiving application 12, then a communication link 14 may be established between the transmitting application 10 and the receiving application 12 and data 16 may be transmitted. In this manner, communications may be established with strictly periodic or completely random transmission schedules, among others.

The demand requirements of the application are based on the observation that relevant characteristics of flows of data between computer systems are probabilistic distributions. For example, the latency of communication transmissions from one computer to another is not adequately represented by a single value, since different communications between an

application and interface may require or allow different latencies. The inventor has found that communication latencies form a distribution of values. Such distribution of values can be regarded and defined as a probability distribution. As a consequence, the distribution of values such as latencies can be described by a cumulative distribution function (CDF)  $f(x)$  (see Figure 3). The function  $f(x)$  defines a curve 34 that may define a continuous probability distribution. As the latency in time increases the proportion of messages that satisfy this required latency increase and likewise as the required latency decreases the proportion of messages that satisfy this required latency decreases.

For  $f(x)$  shown in Figure 3, about half of the messages have a latency of less than two seconds. Every distribution has a unique cumulative distribution function 40, and every cumulative distribution function corresponds to a unique distribution. It is not desirable to specify a single distribution function for most defined qualities of service. For example, it is neither feasible nor would it be desirable to require that exactly half of the delivered messages have a latency of less than two seconds. It is desirable, however, to specify a range of acceptable distribution functions.

A probability assertion provides the capability of specifying a range of distribution functions and thereby specify a set of probability distributions. The probability assertion may be defined by a pair of density bounds (see Figure 4), an upper density bound 42 and a lower density bound 44. The values of a probability assertion is the set of probability distributions whose continuous distribution functions lie below the upper density bound 42 (wherever it is defined) and above the lower density bound 44 (wherever it is defined). Such a probability distribution will be called consistent with the probability assertion.

The density bound may be any function that maps a subset of a real line into a closed interval from 0.0 to 1.0 and that is monotone non-decreasing. The cumulative distribution function any probability density on this real line is a density bound, and any set of points

$$\{ \langle x_i, y_i \rangle \mid i=1..N \}$$

that satisfies

$$0 \leq y_i \leq 1, \text{ and}$$

$$i < j \Rightarrow x_i < x_j \text{ and } y_i < y_j$$

is also a density bound.

Figure 5 further illustrates this point and shows that if an application is

programmed to specify that a time, such as a latency, should be greater than 0 and less than 2 seconds 90% of the time, and less than 4 seconds 99.99% of the time, then the appropriate probability assertion is the probability assertion whose lower density bound defined by a set of two points:  $\langle 2.0, 0.9 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4.0, 0.9999 \rangle$ , and whose upper density bound is the single point  $\langle 0, 0 \rangle$ . We will call this probability assertion ‘Latency PA’.

As another example, if an application wanted to specify that a count, such as the size in bytes of a message, should always be greater than or equal to 0 and less than or equal to 1024 and exactly equal to 1024 30% of the time, then the appropriate probability assertion consists of a lower density bound defined by a set of two points  $\langle 1023, 0.7 \rangle$  and  $\langle 1024, 1.0 \rangle$ , and an upper density bound defined by a set of two points:  $\langle -1, 0 \rangle$  and  $\langle 1023, 0.7 \rangle$ .

When the probability assertion PA and an interval I is on a real line, the “maximum mass” of PA on I is the maximum mass that any probability density that is consistent with PA has on I. The interval I can be open, closed, half-open, half-closed, or infinite. For example, the maximum mass of LatencyPA on the interval  $3.0 \leq t \leq 5.0$  is 0.1. That is, any distribution of latencies that is consistent with Latency PA will have at most 10% of its latencies between 3 and 5 seconds. The maximum mass is computed simply by subtracting the value of the lower density bound at the left end of the interval from the value of the upper density bound at the right end of the interval.

Minimum mass is defined as one would expect. Given a probability assertion PA and an interval I in the real line, the “minimum mass” of PA on I is the minimum mass that any probability distribution that is consistent with PA has on I. The interval I can be open, closed, half-open, half-closed or infinite. For example, the minimum mass of Latency PA on the interval  $0.0 \leq t < 3.0$  is 0.9. That is, any distribution of latencies that is consistent with LatencyPA will have at least 90% of its latencies between 0 and 3 seconds. The minimum mass is computed simply by subtracting the value of the upper density bound at the left end of the interval from the value of the lower density bound at the right end of the interval, and taking the maximum of that value and 0.

The “maximum mean” of PA is the maximum of the means of all probability distributions that are consistent with PA. If any probability distribution that is consistent with PA does not have a mean, then the maximum mean of PA does not exist; otherwise, if any probability distribution that is consistent with PA has an infinite mean, then the maximum

mean of PA is also infinite. The maximum mean a probability assertion PA is computed as follows. If the lower density bound of PA is the CDF of a density that has a mean  $m$ , then the maximum mean of PA is  $m$ ; otherwise the maximum mean is infinite or does not exist. For example, the maximum mean of LatencyPA is infinite, since a small proportion (0.01%) of the latencies are allowed to be arbitrarily great.

Minimum mean is also defined as one would expect. Given a probability assertion PA, the “minimum mean” of PA is the minimum of the means of all probability distributions that are consistent with PA. If any probability distribution that is consistent with PA does not have a mean, then the minimum mean of PA does not exist; otherwise, if any probability distribution that is consistent with PA has a negative infinite mean, then the minimum mean of PA is also negative infinity. The minimum mean of a probability assertion PA is computed as follows. If the upper density bound of PA is the CDF of a density that has a mean  $m$ , then the maximum mean of PA is  $m$ ; otherwise the maximum mean is negative infinity or does not exist. For example, the minimum mean of LatencyPA is zero; further, a probability assertion for a “large PA” contains or encompasses another probability assertion “small PA” if every distribution that is consistent with “small PA” is also consistent with “large PA”.

Having described the constructional features of the present invention, use of the invention related to transmitting messages over a network will be described in greater detail. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the invention may be used by other devices without departing from the intended scope of the present invention. For illustrative purpose, suppose that the service provided by the interface and support software is messaging, and we want to enable the applications to specify Q of S properties before they are linked to the interface. Suppose also that the service in question uses UDP over an Ethernet Local Area Network (LAN). The protocol typically followed to link the application and support software is for the application to request a Q of S while also specifying a constraint on the load that it will impose. The support software associated with the LAN processes the request of the application and responds with a “granted” or “refused” indication. If the request is granted, then the application can send messages over the service, and it will be guaranteed to receive the agreed-upon Q of S provided that it does not exceed the agreed-upon load.

Without limitation, for this example, the Q of S consists only of two values, a latency for message delivery, and a reliability. The application specifies the latency as a continuous

probability assertion, and the reliability is specified as a single number that is a lower bound on the proportion of sent messages that are successfully delivered. Load will also be specified as two values: the distribution of message sizes, which is a discrete probability assertion, and the inter-service-request-times, which is a continuous probability assertion.

5        Assuming that the probability that a message given by a support application to a network interface card for transmission will ultimately be successfully delivered to the message's destination network interface card is equal to the combined availability of the network and the interface cards, and that value is 0.9999, and if the total load on the LAN is less than 25 megabits per second (Mbps), then 99.8% of all messages will be successfully  
10       delivered with a latency of no more than  $3 \cdot N$  microseconds where  $N$  is the number of 1024-byte packets needed to hold the message. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the probability assertion should also account for the effect of transient peaks in load and not just the long-term average load. Similarly, the probability assertion should also take into account that the successful delivery is not independent of all other attempts to deliver messages.

15       To further illustrate the use of probability assertions by an application linked to a network, suppose that the support software interface gets a request from an application to support messaging with a specified load and  $Q$  of  $S$ , as detailed above. If that  $Q$  of  $S$  requires a reliability of more than 0.9999, then the request must be refused. Whether the latency condition in the  $Q$  of  $S$  specification can be satisfied is more difficult to determine.

20       Assuming, for example, that the load specified in the service request contains a distribution of message sizes in bytes  $SizePA$ , which is a discrete probability assertion, and a distribution of inter-service-request-times in seconds  $TimePA$ , which is a continuous probability assertion. We can calculate a bit-rate for this load as follows: let  $ms$  be the maximum mean of  $SizePA$ , and let  $mt$  be the minimum mean of  $TimePA$ . Let  $br$  be  $ms \cdot 8 / mt$ ;  
25       hence  $br$  is the maximum average number of bits per second that the application could present for transmission.

30       Assume, in addition, that the support software had previously agreed to provide messaging services over this LAN with specified loads that consist of distributions of message sizes in bytes  $SizePA_i$ , which are discrete probability assertions, and distributions of inter-service-request-times  $TimePA_i$ , which are continuous probability assertions, for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . For each of these  $N$  loads we can calculate a maximum average number of bit per second,  $br_i$ ,

as above.

Then if the sum of  $br + br_1 + \dots + br_N$  exceeds 25 Mbps, and if the support software accepted the latest request from the application, the total load on the LAN would fall outside the limit, and nothing could be predicted about latency over the LAN. In this case, the support software would have to refuse to undertake the requested service. (There is one exception: if all QoSs being requested are empty – that is, all the applications will accept any latencies (often called “best effort”) – then the support software can undertake the requested service even in these conditions.)

Otherwise, the sum of  $br + br_1 + \dots + br_N$  is less than 25 Mbps, and the LAN can be predicted to have the properties specified above. Now from the distribution of message sizes SizePA, we can derive a probability assertion on the distribution of the number of 1024-byte packets needed to hold the messages. (e.g., if 90% of the messages are less than 1024 bytes long, then 90% of the messages require at most one 1024-byte packet.) From this distribution, and the Ethernet property that an N-packet message is transmitted with a latency of  $3 \cdot N$  microseconds 99.8% of the time, we can derive a probability assertion on message latencies. (e.g., if 90% of the messages take at most one 102-byte packet, then  $90 \cdot 0.998\%$  of the messages have a latency of at most 3 microseconds.) Finally, if this distribution of latencies is contained within the distribution of latencies specified by the application, then the support software can grant the applications’ request for service.

This invention has been described herein in considerable detail in order to comply with the patent statutes and to provide those skilled in the art with the information needed to apply the novel principles and to construct and use such specialized components as are required. However, it is to be understood that the invention can be carried out by specifically different equipment and devices, and that various modifications, both as to the equipment and operating procedures, can be accomplished without departing from the scope of the invention itself.

What is claimed is:

## CLAIMS

1. A system for determining whether an interface is capable of fulfilling a quality of service demand of an application, said system comprising:

an interface capable of both linking to applications and performing services for said applications; and

said applications including a demand specifier that defines a required quality of service to be performed by said interface, wherein a capability of said interface to perform said required quality of service is determined upon initializing a link between said interface and said application.

2. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein the demand specifier does not depend upon system requirements of said interface.

3. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein the demand specifier does not depend upon a medium linking said interface and said applications.

4. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein said demand specifier includes a probability assertion.

5. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein the demand specifier is dependent upon a predefined maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service.

6. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein the demand specifier is dependent upon a predefined minimum reliability of the link between said interface and said applications.

7. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein the demand specifier is dependent upon a predefined required security of said link.

8. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein said interface includes a network



of microprocessor based controllers.

9. The system as recited in claim 1, wherein said interface includes a network of microprocessor based controllers and said applications includes a remote microprocessor based computer linked to said interface.

10. The system as recited in claim 4, wherein said probability assertion is defined by a pair of density bounds.

11. The system as recited in claim 10, wherein the pair of density bounds determine the maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service.

12. The system as recited in claim 10, wherein the pair of density bounds are dependent upon a predefined minimum reliability of the link between said interface and said applications.

13. The system as recited in claim 13, wherein the pair of density bounds are dependent upon a predefined required security of said link.

14. A system for determining whether an interface is capable of fulfilling a quality of service demand of an application, said system comprising:

an interface capable of both linking to a plurality of applications and performing services for said applications; and

said applications including a probability assertion that defines a required quality of service to be performed by said interface, wherein a capability of said interface to perform said required quality of service is determined upon initializing a link between said interface and said application.

15. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein the probability assertion does not depend upon system requirements of said interface.

16. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein the probability assertion does not depend upon a medium linking said interface and said applications.

5 17. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein the probability assertion is dependent upon a predefined maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service.

10 18. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein the probability assertion defines a minimum reliability of the link between said interface and said applications.

15 19. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein the probability assertion defines a required security of said link.

20 20. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein said interface includes a network of microprocessor based controllers.

25 21. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein said interface includes a network of microprocessor based controllers and said applications includes a remote microprocessor based computer linked to said interface.

30 22. The system as recited in claim 14, wherein said probability assertion is defined by a pair of density bounds.

35 23. The system as recited in claim 22, wherein the pair of density bounds are dependent upon a predefined maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service.

40 24. The system as recited in claim 22, wherein the pair of density bounds are dependent upon a predefined minimum reliability of the link between said interface and said applications.

25. The system as recited in claim 22, wherein the pair of density bounds are dependent upon a predefined required security of said link.

5 26. A system for determining whether an interface is capable of fulfilling a quality of service demand of an application, said system comprising:

control means for processing requested services, said control means capable of both linking to a plurality of applications and performing services for said applications; and

10 said applications including demand means for defining a required quality of service to be performed by said control means, wherein a capability of said control means to perform said required quality of service is determined upon initializing a link between said control means and said demand means.

15 27. The system as recited in claim 26, wherein the demand means does not depend upon system requirements of said control means.

20 28. The system as recited in claim 26, wherein the demand means is dependent upon a predefined maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service.

25 29. The system as recited in claim 26, wherein the demand means is dependent upon a predefined minimum reliability of the link between said demand means and said control means.

30 30. The system as recited in claim 26, wherein the demand means is dependent upon a predefined required security of said link.

31. The system as recited in claim 26, wherein said control means includes a network of microprocessor based controllers.

32. The system as recited in claim 26, wherein said control means includes a network of microprocessor based controllers and said demand means includes a remote microprocessor based computer linked to said control means.

5 33. A method for determining whether an interface is capable of fulfilling a quality of service demand of an application, said method comprising the steps of:

including in an application a demand specifier that defines a required quality of service to be performed by an interface;

linking the interface to said application;

10 determining whether the interface is capable of performing the required quality of service of said application upon initializing a link between said interface and said application, wherein the demand specifier does not depend upon system requirements of said interface; and

15 terminating the link between the interface and application if the interface is not capable of performing the quality of service required by the application.

34. The method according to claim 33, wherein the demand specifier does not depend upon a medium linking said interface and said applications.

20 35. The method according to claim 33, wherein said demand specifier includes a probability assertion.

25 36. The method according to claim 33, further including the step of setting the demand specifier dependent upon a predefined maximum acceptable latency between requesting a service and performance of the service.

30 37. The method according to claim 33, further including the step of setting the demand specifier dependent upon a predefined minimum reliability of the link between said interface and said applications.

38. The method according to claim 33, further including the step of setting the

demand specifier dependent upon a predefined required security of said link.

39. The method according to claim 33, wherein said interface includes a network of microprocessor based controllers.

5

40. The method according to claim 33, wherein said interface includes a network of microprocessor based controllers and said applications includes a remote microprocessor based computer linked to said interface.

10

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1860  
1861  
1862  
1863  
1864  
1865  
1866  
1867  
1868  
1869  
1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006  
2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065  
2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124  
2125  
2126  
2127  
2128  
2129  
2130  
2131  
2132  
2133  
2134  
2135  
2136  
2137  
2138  
2139  
2140  
2141  
2142  
2143  
2144  
2145  
2146  
2147  
2148  
2149  
2150  
2151  
2152  
2153  
2154  
2155  
2156  
2157  
2158  
2159  
2160  
2161  
2162  
2163  
2164  
2165  
2166  
2167  
2168  
2169  
2170  
2171  
2172  
2173  
2174  
2175  
2176  
2177  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183  
2184  
2185  
2186  
2187  
2188  
2189  
2190  
2191  
2192  
2193  
2194  
2195  
2196  
2197  
2198  
2199  
2200  
2201  
2202  
2203  
2204  
2

**SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROBABILISTIC QUALITY OF  
COMMUNICATION SERVICE DETERMINATION**

**ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE**

This invention relates generally to multiple systems capable of linking between  
5 systems, wherein one system may provide services to another linked system. More  
particularly, the present invention relates to an establishment or termination of a link between  
systems dependant upon whether a predefined minimum level of quality of service can be  
provided by one system to the other linked system. Without limitation, the application  
software of a first system may be linked to an interface of a second system, wherein the link  
10 between the application software and interface is established if the interface is capable of  
providing a minimum quality of service defined by the application software.




Fig. 1




Fig. 2






Fig. 3




Fig. 4




Fig. 5

**DECLARATION, POWER OF ATTORNEY, AND PETITION**

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that: my residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name; that I verily believe I am the original, first and sole inventor of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROBABILISTIC QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION SERVICE DETERMINATION", the specification of which is attached hereto.


I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the specification including the claims as amended by any amendment specifically referred to in the Oath or Declaration.

I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to patentability in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1.56.

I hereby appoint NIKOLAI, MERSEREAU & DIETZ, P. A., a professional association, consisting of the following attorneys/agents and the following attorneys/agents individually: Thomas J. Nikolai, Registration No. 19,283, Charles G. Mersereau, Registration No. 26,205, Paul T. Dietz, Registration No. 38,858, Steven E. Kahm, Registration No. 30,860, Kevin W. Cyr, Registration NO. 40,976 and Kimberly S. Zillig, Registration No. P46,346 of 820 International Centre, 900 Second Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3325; Telephone No. (612) 339-7461, my attorneys/agents with full power of substitution and revocation to prosecute this application and transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected herewith.

Please direct all telephone calls and correspondence to: Paul T. Dietz, Esq. at NIKOLAI, MERSEREAU & DIETZ, P.A., 820 International Centre, 900 Second Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3325.

| Variable                            | Mean | SD   | Min | Max |
|-------------------------------------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Age                                 | 34.5 | 10.2 | 22  | 55  |
| Gender                              | 0.5  | 0.5  | 0   | 1   |
| Marital status                      | 0.6  | 0.5  | 0   | 1   |
| Education                           | 12.5 | 1.5  | 9   | 16  |
| Income                              | 15.2 | 5.8  | 5   | 35  |
| Health status                       | 0.8  | 0.4  | 0   | 1   |
| Stress level                        | 2.5  | 1.2  | 1   | 4   |
| Life satisfaction                   | 3.2  | 1.5  | 1   | 5   |
| Work engagement                     | 4.1  | 1.8  | 1   | 6   |
| Organizational commitment           | 3.8  | 1.6  | 1   | 5   |
| Job satisfaction                    | 3.5  | 1.4  | 1   | 5   |
| Turnover intention                  | 1.2  | 0.8  | 0   | 3   |
| Organizational citizenship behavior | 2.8  | 1.1  | 1   | 4   |
| Employee well-being                 | 3.0  | 1.3  | 1   | 5   |
| Work-life balance                   | 3.3  | 1.4  | 1   | 5   |
| Job design                          | 3.6  | 1.5  | 1   | 5   |
| Supervisor support                  | 3.9  | 1.6  | 1   | 5   |
| Team cohesion                       | 3.7  | 1.5  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational culture              | 3.4  | 1.4  | 1   | 5   |
| Leadership style                    | 3.1  | 1.3  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee voice                      | 3.0  | 1.2  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational justice              | 3.2  | 1.4  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee engagement                 | 3.5  | 1.5  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational identity             | 3.3  | 1.4  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee turnover                   | 1.5  | 0.9  | 0   | 3   |
| Organizational performance          | 3.8  | 1.6  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee loyalty                    | 3.6  | 1.5  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational climate              | 3.4  | 1.4  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee motivation                 | 3.2  | 1.3  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational structure            | 3.1  | 1.2  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee commitment                 | 3.0  | 1.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational strategy             | 2.9  | 1.0  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee satisfaction               | 2.8  | 0.9  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational values               | 2.7  | 0.8  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee behavior                   | 2.6  | 0.7  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational mission              | 2.5  | 0.6  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee performance                | 2.4  | 0.5  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational vision               | 2.3  | 0.4  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee productivity               | 2.2  | 0.3  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational goals                | 2.1  | 0.2  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee quality                    | 2.0  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational success              | 1.9  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee contribution               | 1.8  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational impact               | 1.7  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee influence                  | 1.6  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational legacy               | 1.5  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee reputation                 | 1.4  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational image                | 1.3  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee brand                      | 1.2  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational identity             | 1.1  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee culture                    | 1.0  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational mission              | 0.9  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee vision                     | 0.8  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational strategy             | 0.7  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee goals                      | 0.6  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational values               | 0.5  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee behavior                   | 0.4  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational success              | 0.3  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Employee contribution               | 0.2  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |
| Organizational impact               | 0.1  | 0.1  | 1   | 5   |

  
Joseph K. Cross

Joseph K. Cross

Jan. 10, 2000

Edina, Minnesota

United States of America

6820 Valley View Road South  
Edina, Minnesota 55439